UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,321	03/17/2004	Stefan Bengt Edlund	IBM-014	3735

51835   7590   03/27/2008

IBM LOTUS & RATIONAL SW
c/o GUERIN & RODRIGUEZ
5 MOUNT ROYAL AVENUE
MOUNT ROYAL OFFICE PARK
MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752

EXAMINER
RAYYAN, SUSAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/6/2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20,26 and 27* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20,26 and 27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

December 6, 2007 has been entered.

2.   Claims 1-20,26-27 are pending.

Specification

3.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: "computer usable medium".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

5.   Claims 26-27 are rejected as being directed to non-statuatory subject matter.

    Claim 26 is directed to an apparatus for synchronizing a client having a client

database with a server having a server database, the apparatus comprising a means

for calculating ...a document score ..., means for initiating a synchronization ..., means

for transmitting… The use of term "apparatus" does not inherently mean that the claim is directed to a machine. Only if at least one of the claimed elements of the apparatus is a physical part of the device can the apparatus be a machine within the meaning of 35 USC 101. At least one of the claimed elements of an apparatus claim must include physical hardware. The specification on paragraph [0007] indicates program code for calculating a document score, paragraph [0019] describes synchronization functionality performed by a processing module (interpreted as software), and at [0007] program code for transmitting. The claim is directed to software per se and therefore non-statuatory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-20, 26-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication Number 2003/0172113 A1 issued to Brian A. Cameron et al ("Cameron") and US 2004/0230598 issued to Stephen Robertson et al ("Robertson") and US 7,092,977 B2 issued to Albert Leung et al ("Leung").

As per independent claim 1, Cameron teaches synchronizing a client having a client database with a server having a server database and transmitting documents (paragraph 7, lines 4-8, synchronizing documents between server and client); Initiating a synchronization task at one of the client, … and identifying the server and the server database fro synchronization (paragraph 12 and paragraph 42, as during synchronization server or small device (client) notifies the other of changes and update).

Cameron does not explicitly teach calculating for a plurality of times and a plurality of clients a document score for each of a plurality of documents in the server database and documents which, the document score designating an importance of a respective one of the documents to a respective one of the clients at one of the times the document to the client and transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the client based on a respective document score for a latest time. Robertson does teach these limitations (paragraph 20, new documents which include documents newly received to the document filtering system and/or documents currently in the system which have been modified and paragraph 49 the new documents are scored) and (paragraph 49, lines 16-20 as profile score field which stores the score that indicates how well the terms in the document associated with the profile scoring file match the terms in the user profile and paragraph 20 lines 15-19, sending document to user) to deliver to a user, electronic documents that a user may find relevant. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cameron with calculating a document score for each of a plurality of documents in the server database, the document score designating an importance of the document

to the client and transmitting one of the documents) to deliver to a user, electronic documents that a user may find relevant as described by Robertson (paragraph 1, lines 14-15).

Cameron and Robertson do not explicitly teach the threshold value and comparison. Leung does teach this limitation (page 9 lines 25-30, storage capacity threshold) to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cameron and Robertson with the threshold value and comparison to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources as described by Leung (Abstract).

As per claim 2, same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the transmitting comprises transmitting the one of the documents in the server database to the client if the respective document score exceeds a threshold value (paragraph 61, threshold value).

As per claim 3 same as claim arguments above and Leung teaches:

the threshold value based on a data storage capacity of the client. Leung does teach this limitation (page 9 lines 25-30, storage capacity threshold).

As per claim 4 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score for one of the documents is determined from

at least one of a time of creation of the document, a number of times the document has

been read, a time of last access of the document, and an author of the document

(paragraph 20, terms(weighted) in document are compared to terms in user profile and

paragraph 49, score is stored in the profile score field which indicates how well the

terms in the document are associated with the terms in the user profile).

As per claim 5 same as claim arguments above and Robinson teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score is determined from a relationship between the

respective document and another of the documents in the server database(paragraph

65, as retrieved set of previous relevant documents are stored in the user profile and

used in determining document score).

As per claim 6 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

wherein the transmitting comprises transmitting one of the documents in the server

database to the client …if the one of the documents is not stored in the client database

(paragraph 8, 10, server documents are downloaded to the client (small device)).

Cameron does not explicitly teach a document score. Robertson does teach these

limitations (paragraph 49, lines 16-20 as profile score field which stores the score that

indicates how well the terms in the document associated with the profile scoring file

match the terms in the user profile and paragraph 20, lines 15-19, sending document to

user) to deliver to a user, electronic documents that a user may find relevant. It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

was made to modify Cameron with a document to deliver to a user , electronic

documents that a user may find relevant as described by Robertson (paragraph 1, lines

14-15).

As per claim 7 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

 determining if the client database includes a newly created document and transmitting

the newly created document to the server (paragraph 42, lines 1-5, synchronizing

document additions).

As per claim 9 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

determining if the client database includes a modified document and transmitting the

modified document to the server (paragraph 28, edited documents on client are

transmitted to the server).

As per claim 11 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the client database includes a plurality of client documents, the method further

comprising designating for deletion one of the client documents based on a document

score of a complementary document in the server database (paragraph 12, deleting

document from client).

As per claim 12 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

wherein the client database includes a plurality of client documents, the method further

comprising removing one of the client documents from the client database... of a

complementary document in the server database (paragraph 12, deleting document

from client).

As per claim 13 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

further comprising resolving a conflict between the modified document in the client

database and a modified document in the server database (paragraph 100, conflicting

parts of documents are resolved).

As per claim 14 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

further comprising removing the designation for deletion based on a document score of

the complementary document in the server database (paragraph 12, updating

document).

As per claim 15 same as claim arguments above and Cameron teaches:

further comprising increasing a data storage capacity of the client by deleting the one of

the client documents designated for deletion (paragraph 12, deleted documents

increase the storage capacity).

As per independent claim 16 Cameron teaches:

A computer program product for use with a computer system having a server with a server database, the server database storing a plurality of documents accessible to a client(paragraph 7, lines 4-8, synchronizing documents between server and client); program code for initiating a synchronization task at one of the client, and identifying the server and the server database fro synchronization (paragraph 12 and paragraph 42, as during synchronization server or small device (client) notifies the other of changes and update).

Cameron does not explicitly teach program code for calculating for a plurality of times and plurality of clients a document score for each of the documents, each document score designating an importance of a respective one of the documents to a respective one of the clients at one of the times; and program code for transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the client based on a respective document score. Robertson does teach these limitations (paragraph 20, new documents which include documents newly received to the document filtering system and/or documents currently in the system which have been modified and paragraph 49 the new documents are scored) and (paragraph 49, lines 16-20 as profile score field which stores the score that indicates how well the terms in the document associated with the profile scoring file match the terms in the user profile and paragraph 20, lines 15-19, sending document to user) to deliver to a user , electronic documents that a user may find relevant. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Cameron with program code for calculating a document score for each of the documents, the document score designating an importance of the document

to a client and program code for transmitting one of the documents in the server

database to the client based on a respective document score   to deliver to a user ,

electronic documents that a user may find relevant as described by Robertson

(paragraph 1, lines 14-15).

   Cameron and Robertson do not explicitly teach the threshold value and comparison.

Leung does teach this limitation (page 9 lines 25-30, storage capacity threshold) to

provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources. It would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to

modify Cameron and Robertson with the threshold value and comparison to provide

efficient data access while optimizing storage resources as described by Leung

(Abstract).

As per claim 17 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the program code embodied in the computer useable medium further

comprises program code for determining a threshold value, the one of the documents in

the server database being transmitted to the client if the respective document score

exceeds the threshold value (paragraph 61, threshold value).

As per claim 18 same as claim arguments above and Leung teaches:

wherein the determination of the threshold value is based on a data storage capacity of

the client. Leung does teach this limitation (page 9 lines 25-30, storage capacity

threshold).

As per claim 19 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score for one of the documents is determined from

at least one of a time of creation of the document, a number of times the document has

been read, a time of last access of the document, and an author of the document

(paragraph 20, terms(weighted) in document are compared to terms in user profile and

paragraph 49, score is stored in the profile score field which indicates how well the

terms in the document are associated with the terms in the user profile).

As per claim 20 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

wherein the calculating a document score is determined from a relationship between the

respective document and another of the documents in the server database(paragraph

65, as retrieved set of previous relevant documents are stored in the user profile and

used in determining document score).

As per independent claim 26 Cameron teaches:

 An apparatus for synchronizing a client having a client database with a server having a

server database (paragraph 7, lines 4-8, synchronizing documents between server and

client);

means for initiating a synchronization task at one of the clients, … and identifying the

server and the server database for synchronization (paragraph 12 and paragraph 42, as

during synchronization server or small device (client) notifies the other of changes and

update).

Cameron does not explicitly teach means for calculating for a plurality of times and a

plurality of clients a document score for each document in a plurality of documents in

the server database, each document score designating an importance of a respective

of the documents to a respective one of the clients at one of the times; and means for

transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the client based on a

respective document score for a latest time.   Robertson does teach these limitations

at (paragraph 20, new documents which include documents newly received to the

document filtering system and/or documents currently in the system which have been

modified and paragraph 49 the new documents are scored) and (paragraph 49, lines

16-20 as profile score field which stores the score that indicates how well the terms in

the document associated with the profile scoring file match the terms in the user profile

and paragraph 20, lines 15-19, sending document to user) to deliver to a user ,

electronic documents that a user may find relevant. It would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify

Cameron with calculating a document score for each of a plurality of documents in the

server database, the document score designating an importance of the document to the

client and means for transmitting one of the documents in the server database to the

client based on a respective document score to deliver to a user , electronic documents

that a user may find relevant as described by Robertson (paragraph 1, lines 14-15).

Cameron and Robertson do not explicitly teach the threshold value and

comparison . Leung does teach this limitation (page 9 lines 25-30, storage capacity

threshold) to provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources. It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was

made to modify Cameron and Robertson with the threshold value and comparison to

provide efficient data access while optimizing storage resources as described by Leung

(Abstract).

As per claim 27 same as claim arguments above and Robertson teaches:

further comprising means for determining a threshold value, the one of the documents

in the server database being transmitted to the client if the respective document score

exceeds the threshold value(paragraph 61, threshold value).

Claims 8,10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Cameron and Robertson and Leung as applied to claims 1,7,9 above, and

further in view of US 2005/0071741 issued to Anurag Acharya et al

("Acharya").

As per claim 8 same as claim arguments above and Cameron and Robertson and

Leung do not explicitly teach further comprising assigning a document score having a

maximum value to the newly created document . Acharya does teach this limitation

(paragraph 0043 as modifying document scores based on the age of the document

which equates to a newly created document) to improve the quality of search results. It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify Cameron and Robertson and Leung with assigning a

document score having a maximum value to the newly created document to improve the

quality of search results as described by Acharya (paragraph 10).

As per claim 10 same as claim arguments above and Cameron and Robertson and

Leung do not explicitly teach further comprising assigning a document score having a

maximum value to the modified document . Acharya does teach this limitation (

paragraph 0043 as modifying document scores based on the age of the document

which equates to a newly modified document) to improve the quality of search results. It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify Cameron and Robertson and Leung with assigning a

document score having a maximum value to the modified document to improve the

quality of search results as described by Acharya (paragraph 10).

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed December 6, 2007 have been fully considered but

they are not persuasive. Applicant argues prior art of record does not teach

calculating for a plurality of times and a plurality of clients a document score for each of

a plurality of documents in the server database. . Robertson does teach calculating for a

plurality of times and a plurality of clients a document score for each of a plurality of

documents in the server database at (paragraph 20, new documents which include

documents newly received to the document filtering system and/or documents currently

in the system which have been modified are scored (paragraph 49 the new documents

are scored, each new document is processed by the document filtering system and a

profile scoring record is associated with each document and user profile).

Contact Information

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Susan F. Rayyan whose telephone number is 571-272-

1675. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

Susan Rayyan
March 18, 2008